

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/736,765	12/16/2003	Ram Huggahalli	P17381	5720		
28062 75	590 09/12/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER		
	ASCHOFF, TALWALI	FRANKLIN,	FRANKLIN, RICHARD B			
5 ELM STREET NEW CANAAN, CT 06840			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2181			
			DATE MAILED: 09/12/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/736,765	HUGGAHALLI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Richard Franklin	2181	

Before the filling of all Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Richard Franklin	2181				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 24 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.				
. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo- places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complian time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aft otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in e	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.					
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN			
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the let forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	nliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external and the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th				
	but prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered b	0001100			
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)	onsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1						
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		•	-			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		II be entered and an e	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
B. ☑ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	ut before or on the date of filing a N	otice of Anneal will no	nt he entered			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 0. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		, 10 00,000 07 00,000				
1. The request for reconsideration has been considered by .	ut does NOT place the application i					
2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	- 1. h .m	Home The			
2. □ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
FRITZ FLEMING						
	SI	JPERVISORY PATENT				
		TECHNOLOGY CENTI				
		9/7/12) C			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claims 12 and 20 have been amended to include new limitations not considered at the close of prosecution and not examined in the Final Office Action, therefore requiring further search and consideration. It appears that the final rejection of claim 1 and newly added claim 22 would be overcome by Applicant's statement of common ownership.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant's statement of common ownership does not show good and sufficient reasons why the evidence was not earlier presented. The same grounds of rejection used in the Final Office Action were relied upon in the Non-Final Office Action. However, Applicant did not submit the evidence of common ownership after the Non-Final Office Action. Applicant has not stated why the statement of common ownership was not submitted earlier, after the Non-Final Rejection, and why it is necessary to submit the statement at this time.